

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,036,461 to Elliot et al. The Examiner also allowed claim 7 and objected to claims 5, 6, and 12 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has canceled claims 1-4, 8-11 and 13. Applicant has also rewritten each of dependent claims 5, 6, and 12 in independent form to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims, there being no intervening claims. As a result, claims 5-7 and 12 remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, 8-11 and 13 under § 102(b) as anticipated by Elliot et al. However, to advance prosecution, Applicant has canceled claims 1-4, 8-11 and 13 without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. As a result, the Section 102(b) rejection has been rendered moot.

Applicant submits that the remaining claims 5, 6, and 12 are in condition for allowance in view of the Examiner having objected to those claims and Applicant having rewritten each of those claims in independent form. In view of claim 7 having been allowed by the Examiner, claims 5-7 and 12 should be in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A favorable action is requested.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 2, 2007

By: 

Richard V. Burgujian
Reg. No. 31,744